



CEL & Associates, Inc.

Real Estate Strategies, Benchmarking & Performance Solutions

2019 SUMMARY OF NAVY PPV HOUSING FOR COMMANDER NAVY INSTALLATIONS COMMAND

Prepared by: CEL & Associates, Inc.

Prepared: January 2020



Introduction

CEL & Associates, Inc. ("CEL") prepared this report by using the results from each Navy PPV Partners Fall 2019 CEL surveyed project(s) and comparing against the Spring 2019 "Out of Cycle" or "OOC" survey conducted by CEL for Commander Navy Installations Command "CNIC". The survey included Family Housing ("FH") and Unaccompanied Housing ("UH") residents living in Navy privatized ("PPV") housing.

This Summary is a high-level overview of results.

The complete REACT Methodology has been added as Addendum A and B.

A. Overall Family Housing Results

1. Response Rates:

The overall response rate for the Navy PPV FH survey of 35.8% is considered in the very good range for multifamily housing and a reflection of the resident opinion.

A minimum response rate goal of 20% was set for each Project and Installation as well as each neighborhood within an Installation. All Family Housing Installations achieved this goal.

Response Rate Data FH

| | |
|---------------------|--------|
| # of Projects | 10 |
| Surveys Distributed | 34,778 |
| Surveys Received | 12,459 |
| Response Rate | 35.8% |

2. Overall Satisfaction Index Results for FH:

The Overall Score (80.2) and Service Score (82.5) for Navy FH PPV is within the CEL rating of "Very Good" (84.9 to 80.0). The Property Score (76.5) is within the range of "Good". *Reference "Addendum B" Evaluating Scores.*

3. Overall Satisfaction Results by Project:

Overall satisfaction scores ranged from a high of 89.5 (Kingsville) to a low of 74.7 (Hawaii).

| Project | Overall | Property | Service | Dist. | Rec. | % Rec. |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Navy PPV Overall FH | 80.2 | 76.5 | 82.5 | 34,778 | 12,459 | 35.8% |
| HAWAII (Hunt) | 74.7 | 70.3 | 77.1 | 4,177 | 1482 | 35.5% |
| KINGSVILLE II (Hunt) | 89.5 | 85.0 | 92.4 | 147 | 92 | 62.6% |
| MASD (Lincoln) | 84.5 | 82.8 | 85.4 | 239 | 95 | 39.7% |
| MID-ATLANTIC (Lincoln) | 76.5 | 74.4 | 77.5 | 5,334 | 1,510 | 28.3% |
| MIDWEST (Hunt) | 77.6 | 73.1 | 80.7 | 1,607 | 658 | 40.9% |
| NEW ORLEANS (Patrician) | 82.3 | 80.5 | 83.8 | 835 | 322 | 38.6% |
| NORTHEAST (BBC) | 82.9 | 79.2 | 85.3 | 2,991 | 883 | 29.5% |
| NORTHWEST (Hunt) | 75.5 | 72.8 | 77.5 | 3,226 | 1155 | 35.8% |
| SDFH (Lincoln) | 83.5 | 79.1 | 86.3 | 11,650 | 4,720 | 40.5% |
| SOUTHEAST (BBC) | 80.4 | 77.6 | 82.5 | 4,569 | 1,541 | 33.7% |
| Navy PPV Overall UH | 87.1 | 87.0 | 86.5 | 5,713 | 1002 | 17.5% |
| HRUH UH (ACC) | 75.7 | 76.3 | 73.6 | 3,358 | 420 | 12.5% |
| SDUH UH (Clark) | 94.8 | 93.8 | 95.6 | 2,355 | 582 | 24.7% |

Scores are not a percentile. Scoring is 1-100 range. The two UH projects were added in this chart and referenced on page 5.



4. Current and Prior Scores by FH PPV Project:

Scores increased for all Satisfaction Indexes from the Spring “OOC” survey to Fall of 2019 survey for all Navy FH PPV Projects. The average increase for the Overall Satisfaction Index was 9.6 points. The largest increase was 12.1 points for Northwest and the smallest increase was 6.5 points for Hawaii.

| Sat. Index | Survey Period | North-East | South-East | Hawaii | Kings-ville | Mid-West | North-West | MASD | Mid-Atlantic | SDFH | New Orleans |
|------------|-------------------|------------|------------|--------|-------------|----------|------------|---------|--------------|---------|-------------|
| | | BBC | BBC | Hunt | Hunt | Hunt | Hunt | Lincoln | Lincoln | Lincoln | Patrician |
| Overall | Fall 2019 | 82.9 | 80.4 | 74.7 | 89.5 | 77.6 | 75.5 | 84.5 | 76.5 | 83.5 | 82.3 |
| | OOC 2019 | 71.9 | 70.1 | 68.2 | 78.6 | 66.2 | 63.4 | 77.9 | 64.9 | 74.9 | 75.3 |
| | Var. to OOC | 11.0 | 10.3 | 6.5 | 10.9 | 11.4 | 12.1 | 6.6 | 11.6 | 8.6 | 7.0 |
| | 2018 | 84.5 | 86.0 | 75.7 | 88.8 | 77.5 | 74.7 | 89.1 | 78.7 | 86.6 | 85.5 |
| | Var. to Fall 2019 | -1.6 | -5.6 | -1.0 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.8 | -4.6 | -2.2 | -3.1 | -3.2 |
| Property | Fall 2019 | 79.2 | 77.6 | 70.3 | 85.0 | 73.1 | 72.8 | 82.8 | 74.4 | 79.1 | 80.5 |
| | OOC 2019 | 68.9 | 69.0 | 66.6 | 74.1 | 63.9 | 63.8 | 78.1 | 64.2 | 71.9 | 74.2 |
| | Var. to OOC | 10.3 | 8.6 | 3.7 | 10.9 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 4.7 | 10.2 | 7.2 | 6.3 |
| | 2018 | 82.7 | 84.8 | 74.6 | 86.0 | 75.8 | 74.0 | 88.1 | 77.6 | 84.1 | 84.9 |
| | Var. to Fall 2019 | -3.5 | -7.2 | -4.3 | -1.0 | -2.7 | -1.2 | -5.3 | -3.2 | -5.0 | -4.4 |
| Service | Fall 2019 | 85.3 | 82.5 | 77.1 | 92.4 | 80.7 | 77.5 | 85.4 | 77.5 | 86.3 | 83.8 |
| | OOC 2019 | 73.2 | 70.7 | 68.4 | 82.5 | 67.7 | 63.3 | 77.7 | 64.6 | 76.9 | 76.2 |
| | Var. to OOC | 12.1 | 11.8 | 8.7 | 9.9 | 13 | 14.2 | 7.7 | 12.9 | 9.4 | 7.6 |
| | 2018 | 85.1 | 86.6 | 75.5 | 91.4 | 78.7 | 74.9 | 89.5 | 79.5 | 88.5 | 86.1 |
| | Var. to Fall 2019 | 0.2 | -4.1 | 1.6 | 1 | 2 | 2.6 | -4.1 | -2 | -2.2 | -2.3 |

Scores are not a percentile. Scoring is 1-100 range. Out of Cycle “OOC” refers to the survey conducted by CNIC in May 2019.

| Overall FH PPV | Overall Score | | | Property Score | | | Service Score | | |
|----------------|---------------|------|--------|----------------|------|--------|---------------|------|--------|
| | Current | OOC | Change | Current | OOC | Change | Current | OOC | Change |
| | 80.2 | 70.1 | 10.1 | 76.5 | 68.3 | 8.2 | 82.5 | 71.0 | 11.5 |

| Scoring Range | Rating | Scoring Range | Rating |
|---|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| 100.0 to 85.0 | Outstanding | 69.9 to 65.0 | Below Average |
| 84.9 to 80.0 | Very Good | 64.9 to 60.0 | Poor |
| 79.9 to 75.0 | Good | 59.9 to 55.0 | Very Poor |
| 74.9 to 70.0 | Average | 54.9 to 0.0 | Crisis |
| Scores are not a percentile. 1-100 scoring range. Converted to 5-point range example 70 = 3.5 | | | |



5. Current and Prior Scores by FH PPV Project for 5 years:

Between 2019 Fall and 2019 Spring Out of Cycle survey, all Projects have made improvement within each Success Factor.

| | Project | Partner | 2019 Fall | 2019 OOC | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 |
|----------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|----------|------|------|------|------|
| Overall Score | Hawaii | Hunt | 74.7 | 68.2 | 75.7 | 73.1 | 81.1 | 78.6 |
| | Kingsville II | Hunt | 89.5 | 78.6 | 88.8 | 81.9 | 81.1 | 75.7 |
| | MASD | Lincoln | 84.5 | 77.9 | 89.1 | 91.5 | 91.0 | 89.7 |
| | Mid-Atlantic | Lincoln | 76.5 | 64.9 | 78.7 | 82.4 | 78.4 | 78.8 |
| | Midwest | Hunt | 77.6 | 66.2 | 77.5 | 76.8 | 79.1 | 78.5 |
| | New Orleans | Patrician | 82.3 | 75.3 | 85.5 | 80.9 | 82.9 | 86.1 |
| | Northeast | BBC | 82.9 | 71.9 | 84.5 | 86.2 | 87.0 | 86.8 |
| | Northwest | Hunt | 75.5 | 63.4 | 74.7 | 76.0 | 78.6 | 76.5 |
| | SDFH | Lincoln | 83.5 | 74.9 | 86.6 | 84.4 | 85.9 | 85.8 |
| | Southeast | BBC | 80.4 | 70.1 | 86.0 | 83.3 | 85.6 | 87.0 |
| | Project | Partner | Fall | OOC | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 |
| Property Score | Hawaii | Hunt | 70.3 | 66.6 | 74.6 | 72.4 | 79.9 | 77.4 |
| | Kingsville II | Hunt | 85.0 | 74.1 | 86.0 | 80.1 | 77.3 | 73.0 |
| | MASD | Lincoln | 82.8 | 78.1 | 88.1 | 91.3 | 91.7 | 90.8 |
| | Mid-Atlantic | Lincoln | 74.4 | 64.2 | 77.6 | 81.4 | 77.2 | 78.5 |
| | Midwest | Hunt | 73.1 | 63.9 | 75.8 | 75.9 | 78.3 | 78.4 |
| | New Orleans | Patrician | 80.5 | 74.2 | 84.9 | 81.1 | 82.3 | 85.1 |
| | Northeast | BBC | 79.2 | 68.9 | 82.7 | 84.5 | 85.3 | 84.9 |
| | Northwest | Hunt | 72.8 | 63.8 | 74.0 | 74.6 | 77.3 | 75.9 |
| | SDFH | Lincoln | 79.1 | 71.9 | 84.1 | 82.1 | 83.5 | 83.9 |
| | Southeast | BBC | 77.6 | 69.0 | 84.8 | 82.0 | 84.1 | 84.7 |
| | Project | Partner | Fall | OOC | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 |
| Service Score | Hawaii | Hunt | 77.1 | 68.4 | 75.5 | 72.9 | 81.5 | 79.0 |
| | Kingsville II | Hunt | 92.4 | 82.5 | 91.4 | 83.0 | 83.7 | 77.5 |
| | MASD | Lincoln | 85.4 | 77.7 | 89.5 | 91.7 | 91.2 | 88.7 |
| | Mid-Atlantic | Lincoln | 77.5 | 64.6 | 79.5 | 83.3 | 79.4 | 79.4 |
| | Midwest | Hunt | 80.7 | 67.7 | 78.7 | 76.9 | 79.8 | 78.7 |
| | New Orleans | Patrician | 83.8 | 76.2 | 86.1 | 81.6 | 83.3 | 87.0 |
| | Northeast | BBC | 85.3 | 73.2 | 85.1 | 87.1 | 88.0 | 87.7 |
| | Northwest | Hunt | 77.5 | 63.3 | 74.9 | 76.8 | 79.3 | 76.6 |
| | SDFH | Lincoln | 86.3 | 76.9 | 88.5 | 86.2 | 87.6 | 87.7 |
| | Southeast | BBC | 82.5 | 70.7 | 86.6 | 84.0 | 86.5 | 88.5 |

The highlighted cells represent the high, low and median score range. Scores are not a percentile. Scoring is 1-100 range.



6. Current and Prior Scores by UH PPV Project for 5 years:

Between 2019 Fall and 2019 Spring Out of Cycle survey, each Project has made improvement within each Success Factor.

| | Project | Partner | 2019 Fall | 2019 OOC | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 |
|----------------|------------------|---------|-----------|----------|------|------|------|------|
| Overall Score | Hampton Roads UH | ACC | 75.7 | 68.8 | 83.3 | 85.8 | 85.4 | 86.9 |
| | San Diego UH | Clark | 94.8 | 86.7 | 95.1 | 96.0 | 95.6 | 93.9 |
| | Project | Partner | Fall | OOC | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 |
| Property Score | Hampton Roads UH | ACC | 76.3 | 69.6 | 83.4 | 84.7 | 84.3 | 85.9 |
| | San Diego UH | Clark | 93.8 | 86.2 | 94.4 | 95.4 | 94.8 | 92.8 |
| | Project | Partner | Fall | OOC | 2018 | 2017 | 2016 | 2015 |
| Service Score | Hampton Roads UH | ACC | 73.6 | 66.5 | 82.7 | 86.5 | 86.0 | 87.2 |
| | San Diego UH | Clark | 95.6 | 87.5 | 95.7 | 96.5 | 96.3 | 94.9 |

The highlighted cells represent the high, low and median score range. Scores are not a percentile. Scoring is 1-100 range.

| Scoring Range | Rating | Scoring Range | Rating |
|---|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| 100.0 to 85.0 | Outstanding | 69.9 to 65.0 | Below Average |
| 84.9 to 80.0 | Very Good | 64.9 to 60.0 | Poor |
| 79.9 to 75.0 | Good | 59.9 to 55.0 | Very Poor |
| 74.9 to 70.0 | Average | 54.9 to 0.0 | Crisis |
| Scores are not a percentile. 1-100 scoring range. Converted to 5-point range example 70 = 3.5 | | | |



7. Scores and Rating by Installation sorted by Overall Score:

Of the 40 Installations, 62.5% (25) rated in the Outstanding to Very Good range (100.0 thru 80.0), 30.0% (12) rated Good (79.9 thru 75.0) and 7.5% (3) rated Average (64.9 thru 55.0).

| Line | Partner | Installation Name | Overall | Property | Service | CEL Rating Scale Overall Score | Dist. | % Rec. |
|------|-----------|--------------------------------|---------|----------|---------|--------------------------------|-------|--------|
| 1 | Lincoln | MECHANICSBURG | 94.9 | 91.9 | 97.4 | Outstanding | 31 | 64.5% |
| 2 | Lincoln | FALLON NAS | 94.6 | 93.3 | 95.2 | Outstanding | 122 | 73.0% |
| 3 | Lincoln | SEAL BEACH NWS | 92.0 | 87.1 | 95.4 | Outstanding | 179 | 76.0% |
| 4 | BBC | SARATOGA SPRINGS NSU | 91.9 | 87.5 | 94.7 | Outstanding | 191 | 50.3% |
| 5 | BBC | MITCHEL FIELD NY | 90.4 | 86.1 | 93.0 | Outstanding | 239 | 38.5% |
| 6 | Lincoln | CHINA LAKE NAWs | 89.6 | 86.5 | 92.3 | Outstanding | 176 | 59.1% |
| 7 | Hunt | KINGSVILLE NAS | 89.5 | 85.0 | 92.4 | Outstanding | 147 | 62.6% |
| 8 | Lincoln | DAHLGREN NSASP-NSF | 89.2 | 84.5 | 92.3 | Outstanding | 164 | 52.4% |
| 9 | BBC | LAKEHURST NAWC ACFTDIV | 88.8 | 84.7 | 92.0 | Outstanding | 90 | 37.8% |
| 10 | Lincoln | EL CENTRO NAF | 88.2 | 85.7 | 90.4 | Outstanding | 93 | 55.9% |
| 11 | BBC | FORT WORTH NAS-JRB | 87.6 | 83.9 | 91.6 | Outstanding | 77 | 46.8% |
| 12 | BBC | EARLE NWS | 85.9 | 85.1 | 87.1 | Outstanding | 69 | 53.6% |
| 13 | Hunt | MID-SOUTH NSA | 85.5 | 80.1 | 88.8 | Outstanding | 263 | 52.9% |
| 14 | BBC | WHITING FIELD NAS | 84.7 | 83.7 | 85.2 | Very Good | 267 | 49.8% |
| 15 | Lincoln | NCR FLAGS/JBAB/THURMONT (MASD) | 84.5 | 82.8 | 85.4 | Very Good | 239 | 39.7% |
| 16 | BBC | CHARLESTON NWS | 84.4 | 82.0 | 86.0 | Very Good | 894 | 35.3% |
| 17 | BBC | MERIDIAN NAS | 84.3 | 84.5 | 85.2 | Very Good | 148 | 28.4% |
| 18 | Lincoln | ANNAPOLIS NAVACAD | 83.5 | 79.2 | 86.1 | Very Good | 261 | 49.8% |
| 19 | Lincoln | SAN DIEGO NB | 83.5 | 78.8 | 86.7 | Very Good | 8,563 | 37.2% |
| 20 | Patrician | NEW ORLEANS NC | 82.3 | 80.5 | 83.8 | Very Good | 835 | 38.6% |
| 21 | BBC | PORTSMOUTH NSY | 82.1 | 76.8 | 86.0 | Very Good | 177 | 37.3% |
| 22 | Lincoln | LEMOORE NAS | 81.5 | 77.7 | 83.8 | Very Good | 1,463 | 41.9% |
| 23 | BBC | PENSACOLA NAS | 80.5 | 75.9 | 84.1 | Very Good | 509 | 40.5% |
| 24 | Hunt | EVERETT NS FH | 80.1 | 80.2 | 80.0 | Very Good | 137 | 60.6% |
| 25 | BBC | NEW LONDON NSB | 80.1 | 76.5 | 82.2 | Very Good | 1,606 | 22.5% |
| 26 | BBC | PANAMA CITY NSA | 79.6 | 76.5 | 82.8 | Good | 47 | 66.0% |
| 27 | Lincoln | VENTURA COUNTY NAVBASE | 79.6 | 76.0 | 82.0 | Good | 1,054 | 51.2% |
| 28 | Lincoln | INDIAN HEAD NSASP-NSF | 79.2 | 82.1 | 77.2 | Good | 136 | 43.4% |
| 29 | BBC | JACKSONVILLE NAS | 79.0 | 77.0 | 80.4 | Good | 278 | 22.7% |
| 30 | BBC | NEWPORT NS | 79.0 | 75.7 | 80.7 | Good | 619 | 31.7% |
| 31 | BBC | KINGS BAY SUBASE | 78.8 | 75.6 | 80.7 | Good | 414 | 28.3% |
| 32 | Hunt | WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS | 78.7 | 75.3 | 81.4 | Good | 1,452 | 34.7% |
| 33 | BBC | KEY WEST NAS | 77.9 | 75.2 | 79.8 | Good | 631 | 38.8% |
| 34 | BBC | MAYPORT NAVSTA | 77.4 | 72.8 | 81.2 | Good | 803 | 30.0% |
| 35 | Lincoln | PATUXENT RIVER NAS | 76.2 | 77.6 | 75.3 | Good | 698 | 36.2% |
| 36 | Hunt | GREAT LAKES and CRANE | 75.5 | 71.2 | 78.6 | Good | 1,344 | 38.6% |
| 37 | BBC | GULFPORT NCBC | 75.2 | 75.2 | 73.5 | Good | 501 | 22.2% |
| 38 | Hunt | PEARL HARBOR and BARKING SANDS | 74.7 | 70.3 | 77.1 | Average | 4,177 | 35.5% |
| 39 | Lincoln | HAMPTON ROADS NB | 74.0 | 71.2 | 75.2 | Average | 4,044 | 23.8% |
| 40 | Hunt | KITSAP NB | 72.0 | 69.5 | 73.5 | Average | 1,633 | 34.7% |

Note: NCR Flags/JBAB/Thurmont (MASD) is non-Installation affiliated and included for the purposes of this analysis only.

8. Current and Prior Scores by Installation - FH:

Current and Prior Scores by Installation have been sorted by Project and summarized for comparison.

| Installation - Project | | Overall | | | Property | | | Service | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|------|------|----------|------|------|---------|------|------|
| Project | Installation | 2019 | OOC | Var. | 2019 | OOC | Var. | 2019 | OOC | Var. |
| HAWAII | PEARL HARBOR & BARKING SANDS | 74.7 | 67.9 | 6.8 | 70.3 | 66.3 | 4.0 | 77.1 | 68.1 | 9.0 |
| KINGSVILLE II | KINGSVILLE NAS | 89.5 | 78.6 | 10.9 | 85.0 | 74.1 | 10.9 | 92.4 | 82.5 | 9.9 |
| MASD | NCR FLAGS/JBAB/THURMONT (MASD) | 84.5 | 77.9 | 6.6 | 82.8 | 78.1 | 4.7 | 85.4 | 77.7 | 7.7 |
| MID-ATLANTIC | ANNAPOLIS NAVACAD | 83.5 | 75.3 | 8.2 | 79.2 | 73.0 | 6.2 | 86.1 | 75.8 | 10.3 |
| MID-ATLANTIC | DAHLGREN NSASP-NSF | 89.2 | 84.3 | 4.9 | 84.5 | 80.4 | 4.1 | 92.3 | 87.1 | 5.2 |
| MID-ATLANTIC | HAMPTON ROADS NB | 74.0 | 61.1 | 12.9 | 71.2 | 58.8 | 12.4 | 75.2 | 61.4 | 13.8 |
| MID-ATLANTIC | INDIAN HEAD NSASP-NSF | 79.2 | 76.4 | 2.8 | 82.1 | 82.2 | -0.1 | 77.2 | 72.6 | 4.6 |
| MID-ATLANTIC | MECHANICSBURG | 94.9 | 96.5 | -1.6 | 91.9 | 95.4 | -3.5 | 97.4 | 97.3 | 0.1 |
| MID-ATLANTIC | PATUXENT RIVER NAS | 76.2 | 66.8 | 9.4 | 77.6 | 72.6 | 5.0 | 75.3 | 63.1 | 12.2 |
| MIDWEST | GREAT LAKES & CRANE | 75.5 | 63.8 | 11.7 | 71.2 | 62.4 | 8.8 | 78.6 | 64.8 | 13.8 |
| MIDWEST | MID-SOUTH NSA | 85.5 | 74.1 | 11.4 | 80.1 | 68.5 | 11.6 | 88.8 | 77.6 | 11.2 |
| NEW ORLEANS | NEW ORLEANS NC | 82.3 | 75.3 | 7.0 | 80.5 | 74.2 | 6.3 | 83.8 | 76.2 | 7.6 |
| NORTHEAST | EARLE NWS | 85.9 | 78.3 | 7.6 | 85.1 | 78.0 | 7.1 | 87.1 | 79.0 | 8.1 |
| NORTHEAST | LAKEHURST NAWC ACFTDIV | 88.8 | 79.6 | 9.2 | 84.7 | 75.4 | 9.3 | 92.0 | 82.5 | 9.5 |
| NORTHEAST | MITCHEL FIELD NY | 90.4 | 79.9 | 10.5 | 86.1 | 74.3 | 11.8 | 93.0 | 83.7 | 9.3 |
| NORTHEAST | NEW LONDON NSB | 80.1 | 67.8 | 12.3 | 76.5 | 66.2 | 10.3 | 82.2 | 67.5 | 14.7 |
| NORTHEAST | NEWPORT NS | 79.0 | 74.9 | 4.1 | 75.7 | 71.3 | 4.4 | 80.7 | 76.8 | 3.9 |
| NORTHEAST | PORTSMOUTH NSY | 82.1 | 58.5 | 23.6 | 76.8 | 53.9 | 22.9 | 86.0 | 61.5 | 24.5 |
| NORTHEAST | SARATOGA SPRINGS NSU | 91.9 | 86.6 | 5.3 | 87.5 | 80.3 | 7.2 | 94.7 | 90.8 | 3.9 |
| NORTHWEST | EVERETT NS | 80.1 | 66.0 | 14.1 | 80.2 | 71.6 | 8.6 | 80.0 | 62.5 | 17.5 |
| NORTHWEST | KITSAP NB | 72.0 | 60.1 | 11.9 | 69.5 | 60.9 | 8.6 | 73.5 | 59.4 | 14.1 |
| NORTHWEST | WHIDBEY ISLAND NAS | 78.7 | 66.9 | 11.8 | 75.3 | 65.8 | 9.5 | 81.4 | 68.0 | 13.4 |
| SDFH | CHINA LAKE NAWS | 89.6 | 83.4 | 6.2 | 86.5 | 79.8 | 6.7 | 92.3 | 86.1 | 6.2 |
| SDFH | EL CENTRO NAF | 88.2 | 83.6 | 4.6 | 85.7 | 81.6 | 4.1 | 90.4 | 85.0 | 5.4 |
| SDFH | FALLON NAS | 94.6 | 86.4 | 8.2 | 93.3 | 80.9 | 12.4 | 95.2 | 89.9 | 5.3 |
| SDFH | LEMOORE NAS | 81.5 | 73.3 | 8.2 | 77.7 | 71.3 | 6.4 | 83.8 | 74.6 | 9.2 |
| SDFH | SAN DIEGO NB | 83.5 | 75.3 | 8.2 | 78.8 | 72.0 | 6.8 | 86.7 | 77.4 | 9.3 |
| SDFH | SEAL BEACH NWS | 92.0 | 83.1 | 8.9 | 87.1 | 77.7 | 9.4 | 95.4 | 86.6 | 8.8 |
| SDFH | VENTURA COUNTY NAVBASE | 79.6 | 69.4 | 10.2 | 76.0 | 67.1 | 8.9 | 82.0 | 70.9 | 11.1 |
| SOUTHEAST | CHARLESTON NWS | 84.4 | 75.2 | 9.2 | 82.0 | 73.1 | 8.9 | 86.0 | 76.7 | 9.3 |
| SOUTHEAST | FORT WORTH NAS-JRB | 87.6 | 74.0 | 13.6 | 83.9 | 70.0 | 13.9 | 91.6 | 77.9 | 13.7 |
| SOUTHEAST | GULFPORT NCBC | 75.2 | 71.3 | 3.9 | 75.2 | 74.1 | 1.1 | 73.5 | 68.2 | 5.3 |
| SOUTHEAST | JACKSONVILLE NAS | 79.0 | 66.6 | 12.4 | 77.0 | 67.9 | 9.1 | 80.4 | 64.7 | 15.7 |
| SOUTHEAST | KEY WEST NAS | 77.9 | 68.9 | 9.0 | 75.2 | 66.3 | 8.9 | 79.8 | 70.7 | 9.1 |
| SOUTHEAST | KINGS BAY SUBASE | 78.8 | 67.0 | 11.8 | 75.6 | 66.2 | 9.4 | 80.7 | 67.4 | 13.3 |
| SOUTHEAST | MAYPORT NAVSTA | 77.4 | 66.5 | 10.9 | 72.8 | 63.9 | 8.9 | 81.2 | 68.2 | 13.0 |
| SOUTHEAST | MERIDIAN NAS | 84.3 | 64.6 | 19.7 | 84.5 | 67.8 | 16.7 | 85.2 | 64.0 | 21.2 |
| SOUTHEAST | PANAMA CITY NSA | 79.6 | 62.3 | 17.3 | 76.5 | 62.9 | 13.6 | 82.8 | 62.5 | 20.3 |
| SOUTHEAST | PENSACOLA NAS | 80.5 | 68.0 | 12.5 | 75.9 | 66.5 | 9.4 | 84.1 | 68.5 | 15.6 |
| SOUTHEAST | WHITING FIELD NAS | 84.7 | 77.6 | 7.1 | 83.7 | 78.1 | 5.6 | 85.2 | 77.5 | 7.7 |

Note: NCR Flags/JBAB/Thurmont is non-Installation affiliated and included for the purposes of this analysis only.



Addendum A

The Survey: The survey was developed by using a core set of questions provided by CEL. The “core” question set for the FH resident surveys is identical to all private sector and military residents surveyed. By utilizing a core set of questions, CEL can compare results of the Navy PPV Resident survey with other military and private sector housing results.

CNIC added supplemental, un-coded questions to the survey. The results derived from the supplemental questions were reported separately so as to not impact the overall scores, nor prevent a direct comparative analysis between all locations and service branches surveyed by CEL.

The Survey Process: CEL worked with CNIC and each PPV Partner to set up the survey process and to obtain information on each neighborhood to be surveyed within each Installation. The PPV Partners provided the email addresses which were compared to a Master Unit List of all homes and occupancy. All surveys were completed online and only CEL had access to the results of any individual survey.

- ◆ **Core set of questions used for comparison to private sector and military housing.**
- ◆ **The surveys were conducted online for all projects. Email invitations were sent to each home.**
- ◆ **The results derived from any supplemental questions are reported separately so as to not impact the overall scores.**

- ◆ **Distribution:** The survey was distributed to residents living in Navy PPV Family Housing and UH residents residing on site at the time of the survey launch.
- ◆ **Population:** The survey was distributed to one resident per household living in Navy PPV Family and Unaccompanied housing at the time of the survey launch.
- ◆ **Online Survey:** A survey invitation was sent via email to all residents with a valid email address. Each email included a unique link to the online survey. Up to three email reminders were then sent out to non-respondents at seven-day intervals. CEL provided an email address that was publicized for each project for residents to request a survey in the event the email containing the survey link was not received or deleted. CEL verified the resident address provided and survey completion status for the address prior to sending a survey link to any home.
- ◆ **Quality Control:** The unique survey link was associated with a specific resident address within a neighborhood to ensure each home only completed one survey, thus ensuring quality control and a consistent distribution methodology.

Addendum B

Analytics: For purposes of assessing resident opinions, CEL has developed a proprietary scoring system. Residents respond to each survey question using a five-point Likert scale. Aggregated answers are then grouped into three overall categories termed Satisfaction Indexes and into nine sub-categories termed Business Success Factors.

The three **Satisfaction Indexes** provide the highest-level overview and offer a snapshot of how a company, Region, Installation, or single neighborhood is performing.

The Overall Satisfaction Index includes scores from all coded questions. These question scores are included in each of the Business Success Factors. Questions pertaining to Quality of Leasing and Renewal Intention are not categorized in the Service or Property Index but are included in the Overall Satisfaction Index.

REACT R Summarizes satisfaction by way of three Satisfaction Indices and Nine Business Success Factors



Reporting: CEL prepared consolidated reports as requested, as well as for each Individual Neighborhood within an Installation. Additional reporting included pre-populated Action Plan templates at both the Installation and Individual Neighborhood levels.

Scoring: The calculated scoring ranges are as follows:

| Scoring Range | Rating | Scoring Range | Rating |
|---------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| 100.0 to 85.0 | Outstanding | 69.9 to 65.0 | Below Average |
| 84.9 to 80.0 | Very Good | 64.9 to 60.0 | Poor |
| 79.9 to 75.0 | Good | 59.9 to 55.0 | Very Poor |
| 74.9 to 70.0 | Average | 54.9 to 0.0 | Crisis |

The CEL scoring methodology is a 1-100 calculated scoring and not a percentile or average. As an example, a 1-100 score can be divided by 20 to obtain a 5-point scale, i.e. score of 70 can be divided by 20 to obtain a 5-point scale of 3.5.

CEL utilized the survey and improvement process used by all its military and private sector clients called “REACT” (*Reaching Excellence through Assessment, Communication and Transformation*). This process allows for direct comparison of all surveys conducted by CEL for purposes of comparative data and in-depth trending analysis.



Evaluating Scores:

The CEL & Associates, Inc. scoring system provides a consistent methodology for evaluating survey results. Satisfaction Indexes, Business Success Factors and individual evaluation questions are all scored in the same manner, for ease of isolating high-performance areas and identifying problem areas.

Scores can be interpreted in the following ranges:

- **Scores from 100 to 85 ("Outstanding")** - Any Satisfaction Index, Business Success Factor, or question score of 85 or greater is considered to be outstanding. The management team should be commended for providing excellence in service, while the Asset Management is to be applauded for providing the resources necessary to keep the property in outstanding condition and market competitive.
- **Scores from 84 to 80 ("Very Good")** - Scores in this range are approaching the very best and the management team should be recognized for their efforts. While only a few points below Outstanding, scores in this category typically mean that while most residents are very satisfied, others feel that more could be done. Special attention should be given to any areas where ratings are below "4".
- **Scores from 79 to 75 ("Good")** - Scores in this range tend to reflect a steady, stable and consistent level of satisfaction and performance with clear opportunities for improvement. The primary indicator of whether these scores will rise is the capacity and desire to take advantage of these opportunities. Improving these scores requires maintaining current efforts, while giving special attention to those specific REACT questions receiving the fewest ratings of "5".
- **Scores from 74 to 70 ("Average")** - Scores in this range generally reflect some satisfaction with the service or property features being evaluated, but the complete standards and expectations of the residents are not being met. Taking action in these areas can remove obstacles to residents feeling Very Satisfied.
- **Scores from 69 to 65 ("Below Average")** - Scores in this range generally mean that performance is just not adequate and indicate areas of necessary improvement. CEL & Associates, Inc. believes it is important to strive for clear satisfaction, not just an absence of dissatisfaction, and therefore find scores in this range are a definite area of concern.
- **Scores from 64 to 60 ("Poor")** - Scores in this range signify substandard performance and strong displeasure with the property and/or the level of service. Improvements are needed immediately. Resident expectations are significantly different from their perceptions of the property and/or service provided. Corrective measures taken soon will prevent the scores from dropping into a category where significantly more time and expense is necessary to improve them.
- **Scores from 59 to 55 ("Very Poor")** - Scores in this range are over 25 points below the scores received by the best in the industry. Corrective measures need a strong commitment, as improvements will require significant focus, time and resources. Scores in this range are not the result of a few dissatisfied residents, but an expression of a majority of residents. Remediation of each problem area is essential if the property is to improve its financial and operational performance.
- **Scores below 55 ("Crisis")** - When a significant majority of the residents at a property fail to indicate a positive response, there is a major problem that must be addressed immediately. Corrective measures must be taken without delay. Improvements to areas receiving these low scores generally involve much more than a policy, staffing or cosmetic change to the property. Significant, noticeable improvements must immediately be made to improve all areas with scores below 60.

Reporting and associated resident comments should be reviewed down to a neighborhood level to better understand issues impacting residents' satisfaction within an Installation/neighborhood.